

because forsooth no Bill without their Assent can pass. So that what is fit and right should never be considered by the Lower House, but what may suit the Palate, or meet with the Approbation of the Upper House, should be the only Rule of their Measures, in the Forming of Bills. But it is asked, why have the Lower House sent up a Bill upon the same Plan which has been so often rejected by the Upper House? The Answer is obvious; because they thought it a good Plan, and the only Mode by which a fair equitable Taxation could be established, and while they entertain the same Opinion of it, they will ever be justified in adhering to it. But suppose the Question should be retorted, Why have the Gentlemen of the Upper House rejected it so often? How does it comport with such repeated Professions of Loyalty to his Majesty, to reject so frequently such liberal Grants from the Representatives of the People? I'll give their Answer from their own Message; because it is, say they, (without attempting to give a single Reason for their Assertion) a confused, absurd, unjust, unequal, and oppressive Assessment. But why did the Upper House, when invited by the Lower House to make their Objections, if in the Course of their Consideration of that Bill any should occur to them, when the Lower House acknowledged that the Bill was intricate in its Nature, and therefore might possibly be liable to Objections; why, instead * of misreciting this Passage, and descending to the low Buffoonery of echoing it back, at every Turn, with an Air of Triumph, did they not endeavour to point out what to them appeared confused, absurd, unjust, unequal and oppressive?

Contemporary Printed Pamphlet
Md.Hist.Soc.

p. 19

And why did they content themselves with such general Objections to the Bill, and avoid attempting to reform what to them appeared exceptionable, merely because a bill upon the same Plan had been adhered to by a former Lower House? The Bill itself is considerably different from that framed in 1758; the Foundations of some of the Upper House's Objections to that Bill are confessedly avoided in this, and in the present Lower House are a good many new Members; all which are Incidents which might reasonably have induced the Upper House to have entered into particular Objections to the Bill, had they not been determined, at all Events, to reject the Assessment Plan.

p. 20

Upon this State of the Matter, I think the Dispute might be rested much to the Advantage of the Lower House; for whatever

* Message of the Lower House, April 9, 1762: "We have formed it on such a Plan, as to us seems most suitable to the Circumstances of our Constituents, and in such a Manner as we conceive the best adapted to the Nature of the Plan; but as in a new System of such a Length, and of an intricate Nature, some Parts may possibly be found liable to Objections, which may have escaped us; and as we, out of a sincere Regard for his Majesty's Service, and an earnest Desire to effect a Termination of that Difference of Sentiment, which has unhappily too long subsisted," &c. [This appears as a footnote in the original.]

Message of the Upper House, April 24, 1762: This Plan you so lately as your Message of the 9th Instant, call "a new System, intricate in its Nature, and liable to Objections, which you suppose may escape your House." [This appears as a footnote in the original.]